

Appln No. 10/820,977

Amdt date December 21, 2004

Reply to Office action of September 22, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGs. 12, 13 and 14, and add new FIG. 14a. These sheets, which include FIGs. 12, 13, 14 and 14a, replace the original sheets including FIGs. 12, 13 and 14.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

Appln No. 10/820,977

Amdt date December 21, 2004

Reply to Office action of September 22, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 10 are independent. Claim 9 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. The specification and drawings have been amended for clarity and as requested by the Examiner. The amendments to the specification, claims and drawings add no new matter and find full support in the application as originally filed. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and a timely indication of allowance.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the references numerals 212, 213, 216 and 220. Applicant submits herewith an amended set of drawings including appropriately placed reference numerals 212, 213, 216 and 220.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a), requesting that the "threaded cylinder fastening means of claims 2 and 34, the textured legs of claims 6 and 9 and the wrap around legs of claims 7 and 10" be shown. FIG. 12 has been amended to more clearly show the threaded cylinder fastening means and FIG. 14a has been added to more clearly illustrated the textured legs. Additionally, the specification has been amended as indicated above to more clearly elaborate on the inwardly projecting base of FIG. 14.

Appln No. 10/820,977

Amdt date December 21, 2004

Reply to Office action of September 22, 2004

Objection to the Claims


The Examiner objected to claim 9 because of an informality. Applicant has corrected the informality as requested by the Examiner.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,810. In that regard, Applicant files herewith a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Thomas J. Daly
Reg. No. 32,213
626/795-9900

TJD/cks

JMP PAS598826.1--12/21/04 1:32 PM



FIG. 12




FIG. 13




FIG. 14

